DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 802 EA 004 477

AUTHOR Hartley, Harry J.
TITLE PPBS: A Systems Approach to Educational Accountability.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 13 Apr 72
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at Supervision of Instruction Symposium 3: Accountability and the Supervisor (April 13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; *Cost Effectiveness; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Planning; Educational Accountability; Instructional Innovation; Management Systems; *Program Budgeting; *Program Planning; *Resource Allocations
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; PPBS; Program Planning Budgeting System

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies the curricular-instructional implications of PPBS. The author (1) describes the purposes of PPBS, (2) proposes a feasible implementation strategy for local schools, (3) identifies potential pitfalls that should be avoided, (4) formulates a possible role description for supervisors, (5) identifies local schools using PPBS, and (6) summarizes the current national status of PPBS in education. (Author/JF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

JUL 2 1 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 064802

PPBS: A Systems Approach To Educational Accountability

by

Harry J. Hartley

Presented at

Supervision of Instruction
Symposium 3:

Accountability and the Supervisor
April 13, 1972

Cuyahoga County Instructional Supervision Study
Richard L. Petersohn, Director
7540 Grand Division Avenue
Garfield Heights, Ohio 44125

The work presented or herein reported was performed pursuant to a grant from the Ohio Department of Education, ESEA Title III Office. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Ohio Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Ohio Department of Education should be inferred.

EA 004 427

Submitted to: Mr. Richard L. Petersohn, Director
Instructional Supervision Study
7540 Grand Division Avenue
Garfield Heights, Ohio 44125

Title of Article: PPBS: A Systems Approach to Educational Accountability

Author: (Dr.) Harry J. Hartley
Associate Dean for Instruction
School of Education
New York University

Mailing Address: Press Building, Room 42E
New York University
New York, New York 10003

Date Submitted: January 25, 1972
(In response to your letter of 1-10-72)

Précis: The major purpose is to identify the curricular-instructional implications of PPBS. A feasible PPBS implementation strategy for local schools is presented. A number of potential pitfalls and misuses with PPBS are described, along with the implications of PPBS for classroom teachers.

PPBS
Harry J. Hartley

The growing popularity of PPBS in education indicates that educators are conscientiously trying to improve the process by which they plan their programs and allocate scarce resources. Clearly, PPBS is an idea whose time has come to education in the 1970s. The theme of this symposium is "Supervision and Accountability," and my task is to indicate how, when and in what form PPBS is helping local educators to become more accountable for their performance. More specifically, my objectives in this paper are to: 1) describe the purposes of PPBS; 2) propose a feasible implementation strategy for local schools; 3) identify potential pitfalls that should be avoided; 4) formulate a possible role description for supervisors; 5) identify local schools that are using PPBS (such as Parma, Mt. Vernon, Dayton), and 6) summarize the current national status of PPBS in education.

PPBS is like a play of many scenes. Ranging from performance objectives and pupil evaluation to cost accounting and data processing, each of the scenes can be grouped into one of two distinct acts: Program Planning (curriculum analysis and evaluation) and Program Budgeting (expenditure analysis and accounting). In the brief span of five years, PPBS has become one of the most talked about and perhaps least understood management science concepts in education. The major source of confusion is the tendency of many to equate program budgeting and PPBS. The two are not the same, although a myth repeated often enough can become accepted truth. A program budget is simply one component of a much more comprehensive PPB System.

STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT. As of Spring, 1972, approximately 1,000 local school districts in 30 states have achieved uneven rates of success with program budgeting. But as far as their achieving a complete PPBS is concerned, the jury is still out. As one could have easily predicted, local officials are discovering that it is much easier to accomplish

program budgeting than program planning. It is far simpler to recast school budgets in new ways than to develop and agree upon educational goals, learner skills, instructional objectives, criterion-referenced evaluation, and teaching strategies for each of the programs contained in a school district's program structure. Traditionally, educational goals have been stated with such monumental vagueness that they are of little current value to PPBS designers. Additional work is needed, particularly in the integration of curriculum development with PPBS.

Problems exist simply because PPBS has not been portrayed adequately in terms of its instructional implications. In most schools, the emphasis with PPBS is clearly on fiscal matters with almost no involvement by curriculum specialists. Quite often, the prime mover of PPBS is the district's business manager. This misplaced emphasis on fiscal management leads some to conclude that curriculum and PPBS represent opposing forces. The best way to correct this notion of adversaries is for curriculum specialists to become familiar with PPBS and actively use it to their own advantage in instructional planning. PPBS is simply a rational mode of thinking that has proven itself equally useful in organizations as diverse as the United Fund, YMCA, industry, Dept. of Defense, universities and local schools.

ADVANTAGES. The professional literature contains many definitions and conceptualizations of PPBS, but basically it is a term applied to a set of interrelated organizational activities. PPB Systems are intended to aid educators in the following ways:[1]

1. formulate goals, objectives, and learner skills
2. design curricular programs to achieve stated objectives
3. analyze more systematically the feasible alternatives
4. provide staff with better planning information and resources

1. Harry J. Hartley, Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting: A Systems Approach (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 290 pp.

5. compare costs with accomplishments of programs
6. increase teacher involvement in planning and decision-making
7. identify direct instructional costs in a program budget
8. specify program priorities and educational values
9. promote innovative programs, teaching, and evaluation criteria
10. increase public understanding of, and support for the schools.

Schools generally have been provided with ineffectual devices for planning their activities and reporting to an "accountability-conscious" public their program accomplishments. The problem has been compounded by the lack of consensus as to what constitutes desired educational "output." With uncertainty and controversy surrounding the notion of educational productivity, the schools have suffered hardships in designing programs, assessing performance, and developing suitable budgeting procedures. What was lacking before the advent of PPBS was a district-wide model for participative planning that related desired outcomes and scarce resources. By portraying specific school activities as part of an overall organic system, PPBS serves to integrate the formerly autonomous elements of curriculum development and financial administration. For too long, the tail (budget) has been wagging the dog (curriculum).

It is interesting to note that even a best-seller like Future Shock contains a layman's praise for PPBS. Toffler states that a "...significant effort to tidy up governmental priorities was initiated by President Johnson with his attempt to apply PPBS throughout the federal government... PPBS is a method for tying programs much more closely to organizational goals... The introduction of PPBS and the systems approach is a major governmental achievement."[2]

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY. Personal visits to schools in 30 states (including Ohio) in the past three years have convinced me that there is no single "best way" to "do" PPBS. Rather, the implementation process must be adapted to the unique strengths and needs of each school. My suggestion to educators wishing to pursue PPBS is that they concentrate initially on the folowing three steps:

2. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), p. 472.

1. Develop a district-wide PROGRAM STRUCTURE.

   This identifies and categorizes into programs all organizational activities, both instructional and supportive. The hierarchical arrangement of programs and sub-programs identifies the level of specificity for subsequent goals, objectives and evaluation. It provides the basic framework for all planning and reporting within the district.

   End Product: A chart listing programs in descending order of detail.

   Coordinator: Superintendent

2. Select target curricular area(s) for PROGRAM ANALYSIS.

   This enables teachers and administrators to focus attention on specific programs, such as reading, in order to develop a procedural model to guide subsequent analyses of other programs. The format includes program goals,learner skills, instructional objectives, evaluation criteria, alternative methods, predicted effectiveness, program constraints, major accomplishments, future plans and direct budget costs.

   End Product: A concise program memorandum (20 pages) for each subject.

   Coordinator: Curriculum Administrator and/or Principals

3. Identify all direct costs in a PROGRAM BUDGET.

   This classifies each program as a "cost center" and is based on cost accounting procedures. The school district's overall budget could be displayed in terms of Function (i.e., Instruction), Object (Teacher's Salary), Program (Social Studies), Location (Jones Elementary School), or Level (Primary Education). The program budget includes the direct costs (teacher's salaries, benefits, supplies, textbooks, etc.) for each instructional and supportive program. See Table I for an illustration.

   End Product: A budget containing both programs and function-objects

Coordinator: Business Administrator

CONSTRAINTS. Admittedly, this is a pragmatic, opportunistic approach to PPBS. But it takes into account the operational constraints confronting local school officials, such as: 1) lack of funds, 2) lack of time (when can supervisors and teachers be spared to prepare objectives and analyze programs?), 3) understaffing (administrators cannot devote full attention to PPBS), 4) resistance to change (in addition to a small minority who cannot be bothered, some of the more conscientious staff may, for the sake of pride, be fearful of failing at something that appears new and uncertain, 5) short attention span (educators seldom stay with one innovation for longer than two years; interest wanes and attention shifts to a new panacea), and 6) day-to-day crises. (Trying to install PPBS into the earthy reality of many local schools is a bit like trying to change a flat tire on a moving car; the school must keep moving.)

PITFALLS TO AVOID. Any new planning technology has its limitations, but the key to judging the worth of a concept such as PPBS lies in an objective comparison of the potential opportunities and benefits to be gained against the possible risks and misuses. The evidence, which thus far is limited mostly to testimonials by local practitioners, indicates that PPBS is clearly worth the effort.

What follows is a brief illustration of some potential misuses that planners and supervisors should avoid. The list is indicative rather than complete, and does not include the predictable charges made by some who misunderstand PPBS, i.e. PPBS is a) dehumanizing; b) decision-making by computer c) limited to quantified outputs; d) anti-curriculum; and e) too sophisticated for educators.

1. People-Problems. The anxiety level of a staff rises very quickly if PPBS is not introduced in a way that indicates sensitivity to the personal needs of teachers. Reassurance as to how PPBS will make life simpler and better should be given regularly.
2. Excessive Paperwork. Most schools already have more than enough forms, paperwork, and bureaucratic procedures. PPBS can compound this problem if not properly supervised.
3. Use of Jargon. Students should never be called outputs, teachers are not inputs, and the curriculum is not a throughput. The new "systems" terminology should be minimized during in-service training sessions.
4. Cult of Testing. Tests are important, but they should not be over-emphasized. Testing that is based on poor instruments, disputable assumptions, incorrectly interpreted data, and purposely manipulated data can offset the advantages afforded by PPBS.
5. Centralizing Bias. Care must be taken to see that PPBS does not over-centralize decision-making within a tightly defined chain of command. Actually, it can be used to help decentralize budget and instructional decisions if that is the goal.
6. Curricular Rigidity. Once a program analysis has been performed and documented, there is a danger that the program will become "frozen." Systems renewal can be achieved only by constant review and revision of objectives, scope and sequence, evaluation, and methods.
7. Paralysis by Analysis. With new analystical tools, there is a tendency for some to overformalize, overritualize and overdocument. The result is that excessive formal analysis itself can prevent school officials from making decisions in a reasonable, intuitive, common sense manner.[3]

3. A more detailed description of political barriers to PPBS in local schools is provided in: Harry J. Hartley, "Planning and Politics," A.A.S.A., The School Administrator, April, 1971, pp. 7-10.

8. Instant Cost Reduction. Many boards of education have adopted PPBS because they thought it was a Mathematical Messiah that would automatically reduce costs. In practice, PPBS is neutral on the issue of cost reduction. It will promote efficiency, but even so, the overall budget for next year is likely to increase because of personnel costs.

9. Inadequate Time. The major unanticipated cost of phasing-in PPBS is staff time. It is difficult to place an accurate dollar value on this item, but it is clear that schools must allocate staff time to PPBS activities.[4] Otherwise, PPBS is done in sporadic spurts of activity, and the result is frustration and uneven progress.

10. Unrealistic Expectations. PPBS cannot be accomplished in one year, nor perhaps even two or three. By its very nature, PPBS is a developmental process that cuts across all activities of the organization. To prevent disappointments over time delays, I suggest that a time-phased schedule of PPBS implementation be developed to show who is to do what and when over perhaps a three-year period.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS. Why should classroom teachers become actively involved in the development of PPBS? Perhaps the best answers are being provided by teachers themselves. The quotation that follows was prepared by the California Teachers Association for its huge membership. California is one of approximately 20 states that has now mandated PPBS procedures in one form or another.

4. Robert F. Alioto and J. A. Jungherr, Operational PPBS for Education (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 23.

"Classroom teachers can reject teacher planning implications inherent in the PPBS system. If rejection occurs, then someone else will operate the planning and others removed from the classroom scene will continue to make teacher decisions about children and the program. Our literature is filled with generalities about teachers being placed in a decision-making capacity. Teachers can rise to new heights of professional competence and performance if they seize the opportunity afforded by PPBS. The business office will keep track of costs, but who will do the program planning? Local teacher associations, especially Curriculum and Instruction committees can struggle with two realities under PPBS. Namely, what new or modified decision-making structure do we want in our school district? Secondly, how do we wish to expand the role of the classroom teacher? If associations and their committees think through those two critical questions, they are on their way to making PPBS the servant, not the master." [5]

ROLE OF SUPERVISOR WITH PPBS. What are the various tasks that should be undertaken by supervisors of instruction? In a number of districts that have phased-in PPBS, the need was expressed for greater clarity in supervisory roles. For instance, both the building principals and district-wide directors of math, science, etc. may each view themselves as"instructional leaders." The net effect in some districts is a duplication of effort. In some districts I have helped to develop a role definition for directors. What follows is a brief description of the role as developed in one particular district. Responsibilities of the supervisor (or director) fall within three major clusters of responsibilities:

	Major Functions	Suggested Time Allocations
I.	Curriculum Planning	40%
II.	Teacher Assistance	30%
III.	Program Management	30%
	Total	100%

Within these three major functions, we formulated 14 clusters of supervisory TASKS that are listed below. Within each TASK category, I have included three exemplary sub-tasks to indicate what the Directors are actually doing. The purpose was to clarify the distinction between the roles of principals and directors.

5. California Teachers Association, The Challenge of PPBS (C.T.A. Research Dept., Supplementary Research Report No. 104), August 1969, pp. 13-14

TASKS OF DIRECTORS

1. PROGRAM ARTICULATION

   a. Prepare and revise Scope and Sequence reports
   b. Disseminate K-12 curriculum plans to the staff
   c. Implement programs, courses, and units

2. INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

   a. Identify needs and serve as change-agent
   b. Examine alternative innovative content and methods
   c. Select innovations and conduct experimental pilot projects

3. CURRICULUM INTEGRATION

   a. Emphasize Interdisciplinary nature of separate subjects
   b. Maintain program balance among buildings
   c. Meet with other directors and principals

4. STAFFING

   a. Interview nominees screened by Director of Personnel
   b. Recommend selection of specific candidates
   c. Plan with principals in assigning specialists to schools

5. IN-SERVICE TRAINING

   a. Conduct workshops for teachers in methodology
   b. Work with individual teachers in the classroom
   c. Conduct orientations for new staff members

6. PROGRAM BUDGETING

   a. Consult with principals and teachers on resources needed
   b. Establish priorities within programs
   c. Prepare and justify budget requests for programs

7. PROVIDING MATERIALS

   a. Screen, select, and secure instructional materials
   b. Improve the overall "delivery system" to teachers
   c. Manage the repair and maintenance of specific items

8. PLANNING FACILITIES

   a. Develop educational specifications for equipment
   b. Familiarize staff with safety hazards of certain equipment
   c. Recommend space requirements for new and existing buildings

9. EVALUATING

   a. Evaluate specialist teachers
   b. Evaluate individual programs and interpret results
   c. Develop "student success indicators" for the school district

10. PUPIL ASSISTANCE

   a. Provide remedial assistance to selected students
   b. Provide specialized activities for gifted students
   c. Explain to students how to use Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring

11. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

   a. Explain programs to P.T.A., Board of Education, general public
   b. Utilize community resources on specific topics, e.g., Earth Day
   c. Prepare press releases and brochures

12. CLASSROOM TEACHING

   a. Conduct demonstrations
   b. Provide tutorials
   c. Teach a regular class on a part-time basis

13. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

   a. Keep abreast of current instructional research and technology
   b. Paticipate in appropriate professional organizations
   c. Maintain personal library of professional references

14. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

   a. Conduct departmental staff meetings
   b. Prepare reports
   c. Prepare general correspondence

CURRENT STATUS OF PPBS

Based on my experiences in various states over the past five years I would like to share my observations on how well PPBS is doing. These observations and suggestions are presented below in a concise manner:

1. Actual Achievements. We now know for certain that program budgeting is quite possible for local schools; but as for the complete PPBS, the jury is still out. It is much easier to develop a program budget than to develop goals and evaluation measures in each program area.

2. Inadequate Time. The number one problem in implementing PPBS is the lack of time. Administrators are generally unable to devote sufficient time to this activity. As a result, most schools are underadministered. PPBS is usually done in spurts of activity, and the result is uneven progress. This particularly is true in the curricular area of PPBS.

3. Dialogue Between Users. A serious current dilemma is the lack of information exchange among users. Each district begins at base zero and tries to rediscover the wheel (PPBS). One purpose of this symposium is to share information among potential users of this concept.

4. Best Approach. There is no single best way to "do" PPBS. It is a process that has to be adapted uniquely to the individual aspects of each local school. Each school should develop its own implementation strategy.

5. Incompetent Specialists. Most speeches and presentations on PPBS are terrible. Often the speakers do not understand the topic, or they know the topic but cannot speak, or they have never worked closely with local schools in trying to implement PPBS, or they make PPBS appear to be a complicator rather than a simplifier. These bad sessions can kill interest in, and support for, the topic.

6. PPBS as a Scapegoat. A lot of bad things are being done in the name of PPBS (i.e., merit pay proposals, dehumanized evaluation, invasion of privacy with computers, "instant accountability," guaranteed lower tax rates, etc.). This is unfair to the concept of PPBS.

7. Turnover Rate. PPBS is very highly personalized. That is, its success depends on one particular person in the organization. If that person should leave the district (PPBS specialists are in demand and are mobile), the whole project is left in disarray. We need continuity of documentation.

8. Excessive Paperwork. Most districts already have excessive forms, paperwork, and dysfunctional bureaucratic procedures. PPBS may add to this problem. My question is, "Will the initial commitment of time and effort result in a long-range simplification of duties for the persons involved?" Or stated more simply, "Does PPBS make life simpler once it is implemented?" The answer should be yes.

9. Curriculum Deficiencies. As mentioned earlier in the paper, PPBS has not been portrayed adequately in terms of its "instructional thrust." The present emphasis is clearly on fiscal matters. There has been too little involvement by curriculum-evaluation-supervisory specialists. This has been a very difficult problem to solve.

10. Self-Interests. Different persons in a school have very different expectations with PPBS. 1) Board members may want measurable test results and lower costs; 2) teachers want power and involvement in policy-making; 3) school business administrators want to improve efficiency and decentralize budgetary decisions; 4) superintendents want better information and increased community support for schools; 5) curriculum directors desire better objectives and new methods of instruction.

11. Evaluation. Some evaluation may not be better than no evaluation. We use simplistic measures (for ex., reading scores) that are even more simply interpreted, and the result is that some lay people conclude that the schools have failed. We should avoid premature evaluation.

12. Cult of Testing. We place too much faith in standardized tests. In most schools, we are now using new methods, materials, and media but we evaluate these programs with the same old tests. For example, in one subject area:

    A. the standardized test was designed in the 1940's
    B. validity and reliability were established in 1950
    C. a broader sample was selected in 1955
    D. the norming group was analyzed in 1956 (these are the parents of the kids we are now testing)
    E. the norming publication was released in 1959
    F. the test will probably still be used in the year 2001.

(Model-T tools are not used to evaluate 1971 cars. Why should Model-T tests be used to assess 1972 youngsters?)

13. Lay Experts. The loudest critics of PPBS are most often the same uninformed "lay experts" who have never visited local schools that are actually "doing" PPBS. Much of the criticism is unfounded, predictable, and inaccurate.

14. Humanizing Education. PPBS is running into the emergent trend of humanism (Consciousness III, counter-culture types). I believe PPBS can be used to humanize our schools because it directs attention to program priorities based on humane values.

15. Abolishing Programs. Largely because of the 1972 fiscal crisis, we are in an era of retrenchment psychology. Our dilemma is not which programs we can add to our curriculum, rather, which programs must be dropped because of the financial squeeze. PPBS can help us make these unpleasant decisions.

16. Local Costs. There is no "venture capital" to support PPBS pilot projects. Title III funds have dried up, and we cannot expect much in the way of federal or state funds to support our activities. This is a severe constraint, and it means that local schools such as Parma must use local funds to develop PPBS.

17. Administrative Responsibility. Based on my visits to schools, I am convinced that one person in the district should have primary responsibility for managing the PPBS project. The use of a task force is desirable, but one person should be designated to coordinate the project as a whole. Shared responsibilities often mean that nobody is actually working on PPBS.

18. Performance Contracting. PPBS may be viewed as a type of internal performance contract. We are simply trying to relate program objectives to the costs incurred. This type of program planning is a major aspect of performance contracting, and so PPBS would seem to provide an ideal management tool for those who wish to engage in performance contracts.

19. Middle Management. There is a great need for leadership training sessions for "middle management." When PPBS enters some districts, the distinctive roles of principal and supervisor appear to be very unclear. The result is role ambiguity and apprehension over who has the responsibility for certain functions.

20. Budget Display. In presenting a program budget summary, one might show increase in costs via categories such as: a) increases due to costs of continuing commitments; b) changes due to student distribution; c) changes due to negotiations; d) changes due to program improvements; and e) increases due to other aspects of inflation.

21. Simplicity. My best advice to you concerning PPBS is: "Keep it simple." Make certain to avoid the jargon of systems analysis, i.e. - children are "outputs," curriculum is"throughput," teachers are "inputs."

22. Pragmatic Use. The opportunistic approach (a time-phased implementation strategy) appears to be the best way for schools to proceed with the PPB System. Prepare three things: 1) program structure, 2) program budget, 3) program analyses.

23. Keep the Faith. The folklore, taboos and mythology surrounding PPBS have been exposed. Now the need exists for operational development and refinement of PPBS components.

24. Completing PPBS. Bernard Shaw once commented, "The basic problem with Christianity is that it has never really been tried." Perhaps the same can be said for PPBS in a local school setting. We have never really developed a "complete" PPBS. Maybe we never will, but at least we will be moving in the proper direction.

PPBS Projects. Where is PPBS being developed in education? Listed below are some of the public school districts that appear to be installing PPBS procedures in 1972.

Aurora, Ill.
Baltimore, Md.
Berkeley, Calif.
Berwyn, Pa.
Brookline, Mass.
Bucks County, Pa.
Chicago, Ill.
Clark County, Nev.
Dade County, Fla.
Darien, Conn.
Dayton, Ohio
Douglas County, Colo.
Euclid, Ohio
Fairfax County, Va.
Fairfield, Conn.
Greenwich, Conn.
Hartford, Conn.
Hawaii
Houstan, Tex.
Los Angeles, Calif.
Maryvale, N.Y.
Memphis, Tenn.
Milford, N.Y.
Milwaukee, Wis.
Montclair, N.J.
Montgomery County, Md.
Mount Vernon, Ohio
New Haven, Conn.
New York, N.Y.
Oakland, Mich.
Parma, Ohio
Patchogue, N.Y.
Pearl River, N.Y.
Peoria, Ill.
Philadelphia, Pa.
Phoenix, Ariz.
Portland, Me.
Sacramento, Calif.
San Mateo, Calif.
Santa Rosa, Calif.
Seattle, Wash.
Sheboygan, Wis.
Skokie, Ill.
Spring Valley, N.Y.
Springfield, Ill.
Trenton, N.J.
Virgin Islands (U.S.)
Warwick, R.I.
Westport, Conn.
San Diego, Calif.

This list is suggestive of the range in size, location, wealth, and type of districts that are introducing or using some PPBS procedures.

Enclosed Tables. The three tables which are included at the end of this paper provide examples of a program budget (Table 1), the format for program planning (Table 2), and a crosswalk worksheet for specific programs (Table 3).

CONCLUSION. The greatest disservice that can be provided a concept such as PPBS is to create a mythology of systems procedures. Such a myth would hold that educational salvation lies in applying to schools any technique that is assumed to have been successful in private industry, defense or areospace settings. On the other hand, not to believe in the usefulness of PPBS and the systems approach is to deny the value of reason, common sense, and the scientific method. Success with this innovation and any other depends ultimately on the artistry of the user. Although PPBS is like a well-conceived play, it cannot guarantee that each actor's performance will be a success.

TABLE I

TWO TYPES OF EXPENDITURE SUMMARY FOR ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONVENTIONAL BUDGET (without PPBS)		PROGRAM BUDGET (with PPBS)	
AUXILIARY AGENCIES	$ 799,124	ADULT EDUCATION	$ 86,497
		ART	272,471
		BUSINESS EDUCATION	142,386
		BUILDING ADMINISTRATION	251,560
		CENTRAL DIRECTION	149,500
CAPITAL OUTLAY	84,297	CLASSIC-FOREIGN LANGUAGE	504,763
		DATA CENTER	210,500
		ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	1,860,948
		FOOD SERVICES	133,708
		HOME ECONOMICS	134,098
GENERAL CONTROL	248,386	INDUSTRIAL ARTS	235,179
		KINDERGARTEN	293,813
		LEARNING RESOURCES	421,312
		MATHEMATICS	854,383
		MUSIC	345,078
INSTRUCTION	9,000,133	PHYSICAL EDUCATION-HEALTH	514,952
		PLANT MAINTENANCE	415,082
		PLANT OPERATION	779,197
		PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES	187,990
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT	137,653
MAINTENANCE	415,082	SCIENCE	621,342
		SOCIAL STUDIES	733,608
		SPECIAL EDUCATION	365,254
		SPECIAL PROJECTS	900,010
		STUDENT ACTIVITIES	85,252
OPERATION	779,197	SUMMER SCHOOL	134,301
		SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION	198,441
		TRANSPORTATION	356,359
TOTAL	$11,326,219	TOTAL	$ 11,326,219

TABLE 2

PPBS INSTALLATION	PROGRAM ANALYSIS PROCEDURES		PPBS - FORM 6
District	Date Prepared	Prepared By	Page 6 of 6 (How?)

POSSIBLE FORMAT FOR PROGRAM PLANNING*
Harry J. Hartley

1.	PROGRAM TITLE	concise, simple (i.e., Science K-12)
2.	PROGRAM RATIONALE	why? justification for expansion
3.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	what? major activities, nature and scope
4.	PROGRAM PURPOSES	non-technical; suitable for community, PTA
5.	PROGRAM STRUCTURE	taxonomy; classification of sub-programs
6.	PROGRAM GOALS	broad, timeless, curricular in nature A. content (courses) C. resources (materials) B. processes (methods) D. outcomes (behavior)
7.	PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	explicit; time frame; often measurable A. knowledge (to know) C. skills (to do) B. attitudes (to feel) D. inquiry (to ask)
8.	PROGRAM EVALUATION	methods; criteria; time factors
9.	PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS	describe recent results of the program
10.	PROGRAM CONSTRAINTS	factors restricting programs
11.	PROGRAM PROJECTIONS	plan future activities; recommendations
12.	PROGRAM BUDGET	line-item costs projected for programs

*Note: Each district should prepare its own format for helping instruct people to prepare program plans (or program analyses). The completed program plan should be concise (perhaps 15 pages), well-organized, and comprehensive in scope (from goals to budget). The format shown here is simply suggestive. Please try to revise it.

sg 9/70

CROSSWALK WORKSHEET

PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING, EVALUATING SYSTEM BUDGET WORKSHEET 1971-72
PROGRAM SUMMARY FOR EXISTING PROGRAMS ONLY

CURRICULAR PROGRAMS
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
SECONDARY

School _____

Existing Programs	220-200 Equipment Purchase	220-460 Equipment Repairs	220-301 Inst. Supplies	220-314 A.V. Supplies	220-398 Textbook Purchase	220-471 Textbook Repairs	220-402 Conferences	220-404 Assembly Programs	220-406 Other	510-453 Field Trip	Total
Art											
Business											
Driver Educ.											
English											
Foreign Lang.											
Home Economics											
Indus. Arts											
Mathematics											
Musics											
Physical Educ.											
Science											
Social Studies											
Media Center											
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	xxx	xxx	xxx		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	
Cost Standard Allocations from Form 5A	xxx					xxx				xxx	